DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 296 TM 003 310

AUTHOR Johnson, Lary

TITLE Teacher Released Time in Minneapolis Elementary

Schools: An Evaluation 1971-72.

INSTITUTION Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn. Dept. of Research

and Evaluation.

REPORT NO C-71-9
PUB DATE Jul 72
NOTE 17p.

EDRS FRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS Consultants; *Elementary School Teachers; Higher

Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Released Time; School

Policy; Staff Orientation; *Teacher Attitudes;

Teaching Techniques; Technical Reports

IDENTIFIERS *Minneapolis Elementary Schools

ABSTRACT

A program in which children were released from school one hour and thirty minutes earlier than the regular time each Tuesday, to provide time for elementary school personnel to participate in inservice training activities, is described. Three Tuesdays each month were designated for individual school activities to be planned and implemented by the principals and their staffs. The remaining Tuesdays were set aside for meetings organized by consultants and directors. Questionnaire returns by 80 percent of the elementary classroom teachers indicated that much released time was spent on: conferring with parents, planning and discussing new instructional methods and techniques, attending faculty meetings to discuss school policies and procedures, attending grade level meetings, and developing new materials with other staff members in the school. About 9 out of 10 elementary staff members felt students would receive a better education as a result of released time activities. Recommendations were to continue the program, continue the once-a-week schedule, provide for more staff input into planning released time activities, and provide more time for sharing ideas and working together within individual buildings. (Author/CK)



Minneapolis Public Schools

US DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIOP'AL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Teacher Released Time in Minneapolis Elementary Schools: An Evaluation 1971-72

Lary Johnson

Ideas expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Minneapolis Public School Administration nor the Minneapolis School Board.

July 1972 Order number C-71-9

Research and Evaluation Department Educational Services Division 807 N. E. Broadway Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413



(7)

Minneapolis Public Schools

Teacher Released Time in Minneapolis Elementary Schools: An Evaluation 1971-72

Summary

Every Tuesday during the 1971-72 school year, elementary students were released from school one hour and thirty minutes earlier than the regular time to provide time for staff members to participate in staff development activities. Three Tuesdays in each month were designated for individual school activities to be planned and implemented by the principals and their staffs. The remaining Tuesdays in each month were set aside for meetings organized by consultants and directors.

See page 1

Questionnaire returns by 80% of the elementary classroom teachers indicated that much released time was spent on: conferring with parents, planning and discussing new instructional methods and techniques, attending faculty meetings to discuss school policies and procedures, attending grade level meetings, and developing new materials with other staff members in the school. These activities also were rated as being valuable uses of released time by the participants.

See pages 5-9

About nine out of 10 elementary staff members felt students would receive a better education as a result of released time activities. Only 2% of the staff members said the released time program should be discontinued. About three-fourths of the teachers said the program should be continued without change, while one-fourth said some change was needed. In the first year of the released time program in 1970-71, only 42% of the teachers wanted the program continued without change.

See pages 2,3

Based on the questionnaire results and staff comments, recommendations were made to continue the program, to continue the once-a-week schedule, to provide for more staff input into planning released time activities, and to provide more time for sharing ideas and working together within individual buildings. A more complete plan for the development of the released time program was recommended as a potentially useful activity.

See page 13

* * *



Table of Contents

Page

Elem-	tary Schools Released Evaluation	1
Invo	rement in Planning	4
Rele	ed Time Schedule	5
Rele	ed Time Activities	5
Sugg	tions for Change	. l
Reco	mendations	.3
Appe	lix A	.5
	List of Tables	
Table	<u>Pa</u>	ıge
1	Responses of Elementary Teachers, Support Personnel, and Administrators to Questions on the Value of the Elementary Released Time Program	3
2	nvolvement in Planning Released Time Weetings	4
3	Released Time Activities of Clementary Classroom	6



Minneapolis Public Schools

Teacher Released Time in Minneapolis Elementary Schools: An Evaluation 1971-72

To provide time for elementary school personnel to participate in inservice training activities, children were released from school one hour and thirty minutes earlier than the regular time each Tuesday during the 1971-72 school year. This was the second year that the Minnesota State Department of Education gave permission to have the Elementary Released Time Program.

The first, second, and fourth Tuesdays of each month were set aside for individual school activities such as grade level meetings, staff meetings, and special staff development programs. Each principal and his staff were responsible for planning and implementing their own program. The third and fifth Tuesdays were used by consultants and directors for meetings with citywide, pyramid, or other selected groups of personnel.

During the year, the Staff Development Committee of the Elementary School Assembly (ESA) was actively working on methods to improve and evaluate the released time program. In November 1971, the Staff Development Committee requested each elementary school to send the committee information regarding the individual school's needs, the released time activities that were scheduled to meet these needs, and the methods that were being used to inform the community of their activities.

After the first semester of the 1971-72 school year, the Department of Elementary Education asked the Research and Evaluation Department to develop a questionnaire to survey the elementary staff regarding the value of the Elementary Released Time Program. This questionnaire was to be independent from the Evaluation activities of the ESA Staff Development Committee.



The Elementary School Assembly has an elected representative from each elementary school and ex-officio members from administrative positions. The main function of the ESA is to improve communication between administrators and the teaching staff in curriculum and staff development areas. The Staff Development Committee is comprised of eight teachers, two principals, and one administrator.

In May 1972 a brief questionnaire was distributed to each building with copies for all certificated personnel. The building principal was responsible for the distribution and return of the questionnaires to the Research and Evaluation Department. After most schools had returned their questionnaires, it was discovered that two schools had not received questionnaires. Since feedback to individual schools was not planned, and since a representative city-wide sample was probably obtained from the other schools, another attempt to send questionnaires to these two schools was not made. A copy of the questionnaire is in Appendix A.

Ouestionnaires were returned by 950 teachers, 223 support personnel (social workers, librarians, resource teachers, counselors, etc.), and 32 administrators (although directions to the buildings did not ask for responses by administrators). Based on the October 1971 "Personnel Sight Count" compiled by the Information Services Center, this return represented 80% of the teachers, 57% of the support personnel, and 44% of the administrators. It is not known whether the sample of support personnel and administrators is representative of the entire group of elementary support personnel and administrators.

Table 1 on page 3 gives the responses of classroom teachers, support personnel, and administrators to three questions about the value of the Elementary Released Time Program. Elementary personnel overwhelmingly endorsed the value of the released time program. Ninety percent of the classroom teachers felt that students, in the long run, would receive a better education as a result of the Elementary Released Time Program, 3% of the teachers did not feel students would receive a better education, and 7% were not sure.



Table 1

Responses of Elementary Classroom Teachers, Support Personnel, and Administrators to Questions on the Value of the Elementary Released Time Program

		Classroom	Support	Adminis
Question	Response	Teachers	Personnel	trators
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		N=950	N=223	N=32
Do you feel that your				
students, in the long run,	Yes	90%	84%	93%
will receive a better education as a result of	No	3	4	3
the Elementary Released				
Time Program	Not Sure	7	12	3
Estimate the percentage of	80-100%	6.8%	60%	78%
your released time that was	50-79%	23	28	19
spent on activities that	20-49%	7	10	3
you think will benefit the education of students	0-19%	2	2	0
The Elementary Released	Continued without change	74%	71%	67%
Time Program should be:	, -		1	
Time Hogiam Should be.	Discontinued	2	2	3
	Continued with changes	24	27	30

Results were similar to the previous year. In response to a similar question asked in May 1971, 86% of the classroom teachers said students would receive a better education as a result of released time activities, 4% said they would not, and 10% did not know.

When asked to estimate the amount of their released time that was spent on activities that would benefit the education of students, 68% of the teachers estimated they spent 80-100% of their released time on activities beneficial to students, 23% estimated they spent 50-79% of their time on beneficial activities, and 9% said they spent less than half of their time on beneficial activities.



²R. W. Faunce, Elementary School Released Time Evaluation: 1970-71 Minneapolis Public Schools, May 1971.

Ninety-eight percent of the responding teachers wanted the released time program continued. Three out of four teachers in this group wanted it continued without change and one of four teachers felt some changes should be made. A summary of suggested changes is given on page 12. (In the previous year, substantially fewer (42%) teachers wanted the program continued without change). Only 2% of the respondents felt the program should be discontinued. This percentage was the same as in the previous year.

The responses of support personnel and administrators were fairly similar to those of the classroom teachers, although support personnel responded somewhat less favorably than classroom teachers.

Involvement in Planning

Classroom teachers appeared to have a moderate amount of involvement in planning released time activities (Table 2). Seventy-one percent of the teachers had input into planning many or some meetings, while 50% of the support personnel and 100% of the responding administrators had input into planning many or some meetings.

Table 2

Involvement in Planning Released Time Meetings

	(Percent)	<u>. </u>		_
Question	Response	Classroom Teachers N=950	Support Personne1 N=223	Adminis- trators N=32
To what extent were you involved in plan-	Input into many meetings Input into some meetings Input into one or two meetings No input into meetings	33%	16%	91%
ning Elementary		38	34	9
Released Time		16	27	0
meetings?		13	23	0
Would you like to have more input into planning the released time meetings?	Yes	53%	54%	24%
	No	47	46	76



About one-half of he teachers and support personnel said they would like to have more input into planning released time meetings. Administrators apparently felt they had enough input. Only 24% of the responding administrators said they would like more input.

Released Time Schedule

When asked to choose between this year's once-a-week schedule and a half-day, once-a-month schedule, most respondents preferred the once-a-week schedule for released time used this year (91% of the teachers, 85% of the support personnel, and 79% of the administrators).

Released Time Activities

Each building was responsible for planning and implementing its own released time activities. To determine the activities that actually occurred, and to assess the corresponding value of each activity, elementary personnel responded to a list of 18 activities by indicating (1) whether they spent A Lot, Some, A Little, or No time on the activity, and (2) whether each activity on which they spent time was Very Valuable, Of Some Value, or Of No Value. Table 3 on pages 6-9 gives the responses of classroom teachers and support personnel to these activities.

The activities in Table 3 are arranged in order from those activities on which teachers spent much of their released time to activities on which teachers spent little released time. Eighty-nine percent of the classroom teachers said they spent A Lot or Some time in conferences with parents about their children. Ninty-three percent of the teachers thought parent conferences were a Very Valuable use of released time. Other activities on which teachers said they spent a substantial amount of time and which they considered to be a valuable use of released time were planning and discussing new instructional methods and techniques, faculty meetings to discuss school



Table 3

Released Time Activities of Elementary
Classroom Teachers and Support Personnel

Activity	Time Sp	pent and Value	Classroom Teachers N=950	Support Personnel N=223
Conferences with		A Lot	47%	14%
parents about	Time	Some	42	35
their children	Spent:	A Little	7	22
their chridien	i opene.	None	3	29
		None		29
		Very Valuable	93%	74%
	Value:	Of Some Value	6	22
		Of No Value	0	4
Planning and discus-		A Lot	37%	26 %
sing new instructional	Time	Some	42	49
methods and techniques	Spent:	A Little	•	
mernous and recuniques	opent:	None	17	18
		None	3	8
		Very Valuable	69%	67%
	Value:	Of Some Value	30	32
		Of No Value	2	1
Paralta manting to		A Lot	28%	0.70/
Faculty meetings to	m4		j ,	27%
discuss school	Time	Some	50	51
policies and procedures	Spent:	A Little	18 .	20
		None	4	3
		Very Valuable	60%	48%
	Value:	Of Some Value	38	49
		Of No Value	2	3
Grade level meetings		A Lot	23%	11%
within my school	Time	Some	47	36
and a delicot	Spent:	A Little	22	36 17
	openc.	None	8	36
		110116		30
		Very Valuable	80%	43 %
	Value:	Of Some Value	19	45
·		Of No Value	1	11
Developing new		A Lot	24%	16%
materials with other	Time	Some	39	32
staff members in the	Spent:	A Little	21	28
school	opent;	None	16	24
		Vower Valuet1-	729	e / 6 4
	l	Very Valuable	73%	5 6%
	value:	Of Some Value	22	40
]	Of No Value	4	4



Table 3 (Continued)

Released Time Activities of Elementary
Classroom Teachers and Support Personnel

Activity	Time Spent and	d Value	Classroom Teachers N=950	Support Personnel N=223
Identifying objectives	A	Lot	22%	2 5%
for my school	3	ome	39	34
ror my benoor	_	Little	30	27
	-	one	9	14
		aluable	49%	51%
	Value: Of Sone	e Value	47	45
	Of No	Value	4	
Human relations	A	Lot	18%	16%
training activities	1	ome	39	40
craining activities	ĭ	Little	26	27
		one	20 17	17
	N	Jue	17	1/
	Very Va	aluable	50%	51%
	Value: Of Some		45	43
	Of No	N .	5	6
Communication skills		Lot	16%	17%
in-service	3	ome	38	38
	1 -	Little	27	20
,	No	one	20	25
	Verv V	aluable	55%	49%
	Value: Of Some		40	47
	Of No		5	5
				11.00
Social Studies		Lot	14%	5%
in-service] "	ome	43	21
		Little	28	19
	No	one	16	55
	Verv V	aluable	45%	31%
	Value: Of Some		49	42
	Of No '		. 6	28
Math in-service		Lot	11%	2 %
HALL SELVICE	•	ome	58	2 6
	· -	Little	23	23
	N	one	8	49
	1			
	Very Va	aluable	5 7%	42%
	Very Value: Of Some	*	5 7% 41	42% 32



Table 3 (Continued)

Released Time Activities of Elementary
Classroom Teachers and Support Personnel

Activity	Time Spent	and Value	Classroom Teachers N=950	Support Personnel N=223
Music in-service		A Lot	27.	12%
indic in octate	Time	Some	19	13
	Spent:	A Little	24	12
	Sponer	None	55	64
	Ver	y Valuable	38%	38%
		Some Value	46	31
		No Value	16	31
Science in-service		A Lot	8%	5%
science in-service	Time	Some	40	5 <i>7</i> .
	Spent:	A Little	26	16
	spent:		25	63
		None	45	ده
	Ver	y Valuable	52	33%
		Some Value	42	32
	Of	No Value	6	35
A		A 7 - A	3%	701
Art in-service	m.t	A Lot		7 %
	Time	Some	24	15
	Spent:	A Little	27	17
		None	47	62
		y Va lu a ble	35%	43%
		Some Value	43	31
	Of	No Value	21	25
Physical Education/		A Lot	1%	13 %
Health in-service	Time	Some	10	11
region in-service	Spent:	A Little	22	14
	opene.	None	67	62
	Var	y Valuable	26%	39%
		Some Value	48	36
	3	No Value	26	25
Descharation 11		A 7 - A	0.00	0.00
Exchanging ideas	m.	A Lot	9%	20%
with staff from	Time	Some	32	42
other schools	Spent:	A Little	34	28
		None	26	9
		y Valuable	55%	6 5%
	Value: Of	Some Value	39	35



Table 3 (Continued)

Released Time activities of Elementary
Classroom Teachers and Support Personnel

Activity	Time Spen	nt and Value	Classroom Teachers N=950	Support Personnel N=223
Developing new		A Lot.	10%	19%
materials on my	Time	Some	27	33
own	Spent:	A Li:tle	30	24
Own	opene.	None	32	24
	Ve	ery Valuable	72%	74%
		Some Value	20	24
<u> </u>	Of	No Value	8	2
Visiting community		A Lot	2%	4%
agencies	Time	Some	23	25
20.01.01	Spent:	A Little	25	23
		None	50	48
	Ve	ery Valuable	42%	53%
	Value: Of	Some Value	41	37
	Of	No Value	17	10
Preparing for my		A Lot	6%	6%
daily classes	Time	Some	12	20
aulij clauded	Spent:	A Little	29	25
		None	53	50
	Ve	ery Valuable	68%	65%
	Value: Of	Some Value	15	25
•	Of	No Value	17	10



policies and procedures, grade level meetings, and developing new materials with other staff members in the school.

Activities on which teachers did not spend much time, but were considered a valuable use of time by teachers who did participate in the activities, were developing new materials on their own and preparing for their daily classes. Overall, teachers gave favorable ratings to all 18 activities listed in the questionnaire.

Compared with the classroom teachers, the support personnel who responded to the questionnaire neither indicated as much participation in the listed activities nor indicated that the activities were as valuable.

In addition to the 18 listed activities, space was provided on the questionnaire for the respondents to list other released time activities. Twenty or more staff members indicated that they spent time on the following activities: attending reading in-service meetings, discussing desegregation plans, discussing behavior modification techniques, visiting other schools, attending audio-vusual in-service meetings, and listening to presentations on special education, retirement, and poetry and literature. Other activities on which at least ten staff members indicated they spent released time were: working on experimental report cards, visiting homes, attending outdoor education sessions, evaluating the school's educational program, discussing test results, and attending presentations about community resource volunteers, perceptual motor skills, the magic circle technique, Indian affairs, drug education, and neurologically impaired children. These additional activities also received favorable ratings on the value scale.



Suggestions for Change

Several hundred responses were made by elementary personnel to the openended question that asked for suggested changes in the released time program.

Many comments were endorsements of the program. With the exception of these
endorsements and other comments that gave information identical to that obtained
from the objective questions, all suggestions were analyzed and grouped
according to similar content. Nine categories emerged. The number after each
response, within a category, represents the number of staff members who made
similar suggestions.

 Between Teacher Planning: some teachers asked for more time to share ideas and plan with other teachers in their building.

Grade level (or primary,	in	te	rm	ed	ia	tе	10	ev	el)			
meetings													40
Informal sharing of ideas													
Team planning													4

2. <u>Planning for Implementation</u>: more time to prepare and implement ideas picked up during released time was requested by several teachers.

More	time	to	prepare	for	imp]	len	ien	ta	ti	.on	ı c	f	id	le٤	18	•	•	13
Planr	ing :	inno	vative	progr	ams													12

3. <u>Individual and Building Needs</u>: many teachers requested that more attention be given to needs of individuals and buildings.

individual classroom and unit development.		•	•	•	•	12
Plan for own building needs						12
More individual choice of meetings						7
Individual research planning						7
Less theory, more practical	,					6
More workshops of individual's choice						4
Less large lectures						4
Staff meetings do not meet individual needs.						3
Plans and problems of individual schools						2

4. Interschool Sharing of Ideas:

Exchange	ideas with other schools.						19
See other	schools in action						3
Visits to	other schools	 ٠.					2



5.	Materials and Instruction: development of materials and discussion of
	instructional methods were stressed by some teachers.
	Development of new materials
6.	Community Involvement:
	More parent-teacher conferences
7.	Human Relations:
	Human relations training
.8.	Released Time Planning: a few teachers suggested better planning of
	the released time programs.
	Better planning
9.	Miscellaneous:
	Fewer faculty meetings

In summary: the suggestions for changes indicate that elementary personnel would like to have more released time to work together, or as individuals, to develop (or become familiar with) ideas and to make plans for implementation of ideas to meet individual needs within their building.



Recommendations

Since this evaluation was designed to give a general measure of the value of the Elementary Released Time Program rather than a measure of attainment of more specific objectives, it is difficult to make specific recommendations based on the questionnaire data. However, a few general observations do stand out.

Recommendation One: Continue the Elementary Released Time Program. Ninety percent of the elementary teachers who responded to the questionnaire said that students, in the long run, would receive a better education as a result of the released time program.

Recommendation Two: Continue the present once-a-week released time schedule.

Nine out of ten teachers preferred the once-a-week schedule to a once-a-month half-day schedule.

Recommendation Three: Give the teaching and support staff more input into planning the released time meetings. More than half of the classroom teachers and support personnel said they would like more involvement in planning the released time activities. Almost one-third of the teachers and one-half of the support personnel had little involvement in planning meetings this year.

Recommendation Four: Provide more time for staff members to share ideas and to work together within their building. A number of teachers asked that more time be devoted to grade level or primary intermediate meetings. They also requested time to more thoroughly develop ideas on which they were working.

Recommendation Five: Although alluded to by only a few staff members on the questionnaire, it may be useful to develop a more thorough plan for released time program development. The basics of this approach have been discussed by the Staff Development Committee of the Elementary School Assembly. Essentially the plan would include the following events.



- Identify the needs at each individual school. These needs could be specific to individuals, to groups of individuals, to an individual school, or they could be common needs identified by area school administrators.
- 2. Based on identified needs, the staff at each school would specify objectives that they would attempt to reach during the year. These objectives would include goals identified by area adminstrators.
- 3. Identify activities necessary to reach the objectives, i.e., what activities will most likely lead to the achievement of the stated objectives?
- 4. The evaluation of the released time program would then be based on whether or not the stated objectives were attained.



 $\langle \cdot \rangle$

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EOUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EOUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
OUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED OD NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Appendix A

The Elementary Released Time Questionnaire



Minneapolis Public Schools Elementary Released Time Evaluation 1971-72

The responses to this questionnaire will be used to provide feedback to members of the elementary staff within the schools and at the central office. Your reactions will be used to suggest improvements in the Elementary Released Time Program. With this in mind, give the questions some thoughtful attention. You should finish within 15 minutes. The questionnaire was designed for teachers so some of the questions may not apply to supportive personnel. If a question does not apply, leave it blank. Do not sign your name.

1)	To what extent were you involved in planning Elementary Released Time meetings.	(5)	Indicate your position in the school.
	1. I had input into planning many meetings		1. Classroom teacher
	2. I had input into planning some meetings		2. Administrator
	3. I had input into planning one or two meetings		3. Support personnel; resource teacher, SSW, counselor, librarian, etc.
	4. I did not have any input into planning the meetings	(6)	Estimate the percentage of your released time that was spent on activities that you think will benefit the education of students.
2)	Would you like to have more input into planning the released time meetings?		1. 80 - 100% of released time
	1. Yes		2. 50 - 79% of released time
	2. No		3. 20 - 49% of released time
3)	Do you feel that your students, in the long run, will receive a better education as a result of the Elementary Released Time Program?	(7)	Which released time schedule would you prefer next year?
	l. Yes		1. Once a week, 2:00 - 3:45
	?. No		2. Once a month, half-days
	Not sure		
4)	The Elementary Released Time Program should be:		BE SURE TO COMPLETE PAGE TWO ON REVERSE SIDE
	1. Continued without change		THO ON REVERDE SIDE
	2. Discontinued		
	3. Continued with these changes:		
		_	
			
•			
			<u> </u>
			
		_	
	<u> </u>		



On the left, check the extent to which you had released time activities in the following areas. Then, on the right, for each activity where you checked Yes, check the value of the activity. At the end of the list of activities, add any other activities that are not listed.

(1)	Activity? (2)	(3)	(4)		(1) Very	(2) Of Some	(3) Of No
A_Lot	Some	A Little	None	Activity - Area	Valuable	Value	Value
				Math inservice			(;
				Music inservice			(2
				Science inservice			(
				Social Studies inservice			(:
				Communication skills inservice			(
		·		Art. Inservice			(
				Physical Education/Health inservice			(
				Planning and discussing new in- structional methods and techniques			. (1
				Developing new materials with other staff members in the school			(
				Developing new materials on my own			(
				Human relations training activities			(
				Identifying objectives for my school			(
				Preparing for my daily classes			(
				Conferences with parents about their children			(
				Exchanging ideas with staff from other schools			(
				Visiting community agencies			(
				Faculty meetings to discuss school policies and procedures			(1
		· .		Grade level meetings within my school			(!
	Released Ti	ime Did You Sp	oend	Other activities: List any activities, special topics and/or	How Valual	ole Were Thes	e Activitie
A Lot	Some	A Little	None	speakers not included above.	Very Valuable	Of Some Value	Of No Value
							•
							
							
							
				<u> </u>			
							

